Vol. XI., No. 3. JUNE, 1921.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Truth and the Creeds 97
Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D.

Church Bells and Campanology 107
Canon T. L. Papillon.

The Incarnation—The *Crux* of the Problem (II) .. 113
F. A. M. Spencer, M.A.

The Pre-Christian Idea of Christ 116
Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B.

The Last of the Romans 120
J. C. Hardwick, M.A.

The Present Position of Re-union 125
Canon R. B. Tollinton, D.D.

The Faith of a Quaker 135
Maurice Pryke, B.D.

Clerical Veracity in China 139
F. E. A. Shepherd, M.A.

The Resurrection Body 141
H. L. Hubbard, M.A.

Correspondence 142

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt., Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss E. M. ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop HAMILTON BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Prof. F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Miss A. GARDNER, Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A., Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON. Hon. Mrs. MATHESON, Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt., Rev. C. BASS, M.A., Canon G. RENDALL, D.Litt., Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., Rev. J. R. COHU, Mrs. MICHELMORE.

Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.
Hon. Organizing Secretary—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, Bradninch Vicarage, Collumpton, Devon.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—P. BAGENAL, O.B.E., 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

CONFERENCE

OF

MODERN CHURCHMEN,

CAMBRIDGE,

August 8—15, 1921.

Conference Committee.

Miss E. M. Allen
Miss C. Barber
P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
C. W. Emmet, B.D.
Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs Reith
C. F. Russell, M.A.

The Conference this year will be held at Cambridge, where by the kindness of the authorities Girton has been placed at the disposal of the committee. The Programme and full list of speakers may be seen in the April number of the *Modern Churchman*.

The Conference will begin on Monday *afternoon*, August 8th, and will end on Monday *morning*, August 15th. The programme proper will end on Saturday *morning*, but it is thought that the extra days will be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

Tickets (including board and lodging) will be £3 15s. 0d. for the week; £2 15s. 0d. for the first five days. *If not paid before July 25th an extra charge of 5/- will be made.* Tickets for the meetings only will be 15/-, for those engaged in teaching 7/6. Admission to single meetings 2/-.

Meals will be provided for a limited number of non-resident members at a reasonable charge.

Tennis. A small charge will be made for the use of the courts and balls.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and also, as far as space will allow, to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.

Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. Bagenal, 11 Spencer Hill, Wimbleton, S.W. 19.

All applications for Tickets, accompanied by full remittance and a stamped and addressed envelope, should be sent to Miss D. Nussey.

HEMSLEY & SONS, PRINTERS, ILKLEY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1921. Vol. XI.

TRUTH AND THE CREEDS

y Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D., sometime Headmaster of Clifton College.

AMONG my most treasured books is a pamphlet which was given to me by my tutor, Professor T. H. Green. It ntains an address which he once delivered to his pupils on e subject of Faith. As he was one of the three most iritually-minded men whom it was my privilege to count nong my friends, so this address is one of the modern classics religion, which can never be out of date, because it is con-rned, not with surface movements of thought, but with the sentials which do not change. I wish time allowed me to ad the whole: but I must be content with a short extract, nich serves my immediate purpose.

'On the one hand, we are called upon to regard faith as the condition of our attaining the highest spiritual life, as that which makes the difference between the man who is as God would have him to be and the man who is not. If we are honest with ourselves, we shall admit that something best called faith—a prevailing conviction of our presence to God and his to us, of his gracious mind towards us, working in and through us, of our duty to our fellow men as our brethren in him—has been the source of whatever is best in us and in our deeds . . . But, on the other hand, the object of faith is declared to be the work of Christ, consisting specially in the incarnation by which he took on him our nature, in the death by which he purchased the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection by which he opened to us the gate of everlasting life. These were events, continuous no doubt in their effects, but which took place in an historical past. Faith, accordingly, is regarded as necessarily involv-

ing the belief that propositions, asserting the actual occurrence of these events, are true.

'The faith, then, which is supposed to be demanded of us as Christians, involves two elements, which, to say the least, are wholly different; on the one side a certain intellectual assent of a kind which, if the propositions assented to concerned any other events than those purporting to convey a divine revelation, we should say could make no difference to the heart or spirit or character—call it what we will—which is alone of absolute value in a man: on the other side, a certain attitude or disposition which belongs distinctively to the inner man, and gives us our worth as moral or spiritual beings . . . There is thus an inner contradiction in that conception of faith which makes it a state of mind involving peace with God and love towards all men, and at the same time makes its object that historical work of Christ, of which our knowledge depends upon evidence of uncertain origin and value.'

The difficulty which is thus expressed finds no recognition in the New Testament. And the reason is obvious. Up to the end of the first century, so far as we know, no such thing as a creed had ever been formulated. The ancient world judged a man's religion by his actions, and left him free in the matter of belief. Even the Jews did not regard the Sadducees as compromised because they denied the future life. That explains why the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, for instance, hardly refers to belief. The examples of faith which are offered in the eleventh chapter are all instances of love and trust in God. No past event, except the creation, is spoken of as matter of belief. Faith is described as the actuality of things hoped for, the assurance of things not seen. And the author says that, 'He that cometh to God must believe that He exists, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.' St. James mentions the idea that belief can save only in order to condemn it as irreligious. And in St. Paul's references to saving faith, there are only two which even seem to approach the idea that faith is the same as belief. The saving faith which is, by St. Paul as by other Rabbis, attributed to Abraham, was not an intellectual assent to propositions, but a perfect trust in God's love and goodness.

The development of the Christian Church, which cut across all existing boundaries of race and language and locality, justified and almost compelled the formulation of a creed. As we all know, the main object of a creed was protective. It was not intended to state all the main truths which Christians held

but rather to contradict errors which had found advocates. That fact accounts for the strange omissions which are obvious in our creeds, and for the predominance of historical propositions. For the differences which arose among the Christians of the first three centuries did not primarily concern what St. Paul or the author of the Hebrews called faith, but rather the framework of beliefs in which that faith was being gradually enclosed. Practically all professing Christians assented to such propositions as the following:

'There is one God who is the creator and ruler of the world.
God is just and loving, and requires justice and love in men.
God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself.
The historical person Jesus was the revealer of God.
The risen Christ is present to them that love him.

Now these propositions, and others which might be added, all answer to Green's definition of faith, as well as that given in the Hebrews. They present religious truths, by which men can live, with the smallest admixture of what is called fact.

But propositions of this general character are liable to be misunderstood. For example, St. Paul's words, 'God was in Christ, reconciling the word to Himself,' could be so wrested as to bear a docetic meaning: and to protect the simple believer from docetic error, it was well to make positive statements about the physical truth and suffering of Jesus Christ. Other errors evoked other statements of fact: and so bit by bit a frame was constructed which would, it was hoped, protect the true picture of religious faith from injury. An admirable intention, which was carried out with temporary success. But the success could not, in the nature of things, be permanent. For, unfortunately, statements of fact are usually not simple, but composite. The language in which the statement is made must be the language of the time, and is therefore tinged with the science and philosophy of the time. What could appear to be a simpler statement of fact than, 'He ascended into heaven'? Yet it is obvious to all of us that these words involve a conception of the universe which is demonstrably false: for they have no meaning unless there be a fixed earth, the centre of the universe, and a solid vault of heaven over-arching it.

Now, it is an apologetic commonplace to praise the Apostles' Creed because it consists almost entirely of statements of fact, not of theories, and therefore its permanence is secure. But that conclusion does not follow from the premises: for statements, and even single words, take new aspects in the course of time, and men perceive that the statement which was intended to secure the fact has really obscured it. The frame of statements, therefore, however valuable for a time, may cease to be a protection and become a danger, unless provision is made for renewing it as occasion arises. Such provision as there was—that of oecumenical councils—came to an end in the dark ages. The creeds, untouched for centuries, became sacrosanct: men ceased to be capable of distinguishing between the form and the substance of a statement: and they regarded any criticism of the frame as an attack upon the picture. Half the tragedies of religious history in the last five centuries are due to this cause. When what was meant to be a shrine for truth becomes itself the object of worship, the truth suffers both in the eyes of those who see the faults of the shrine and of those who maintain its perfection.

In the particular case to which I have referred—the clause in the creeds about the Ascension—tragedy has been avoided by the establishment of a *modus vivendi*. It is true that Galileo only escaped being burned alive by recantation: for the Roman Curia saw at once that if the earth went round the sun, various statements in the creed must be incorrect: and all Europe would have supported them. But the truth gradually penetrated men's minds, and Rome learned to wink at an accommodation. So that now, though the uneducated still understand that clause literally, educated men of all denominations treat it as symbolical. In every church, each Sunday, men stand side by side who repeat it in two or three different senses; and there is no feeling of conflict, because the ultimate religious meaning of all is the same.

The disappearance of the geocentric astronomy has in the same way destroyed the literal meaning of two other clauses: 'He descended into hell'—'From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.' In these two cases, too, the same *modus vivendi* is observed. It is tacitly conceded that

educated men may understand them symbolically, and do no wrong in repeating words to whose liberal meaning they cannot assent.

We may express the same thing in another way. Three clauses of the creeds have in fact been transferred from the class of propositions to which intellectual assent is demanded, to the class of religious truths by which men live, but which defy definition. Surely that does not impoverish our spiritual life, but enriches it.

The question inevitably arises: Are there any other clauses in either of our creeds to which the same principle may be applied? Two groups of clauses require to be considered separately. Bishop Gore wrote a few years ago:

> 'Theologians have always applied the principal of symbolism to the words and phrases used by the Church in speaking about God.'

He instances the attribution to God of mercy and justice, foreknowledge, descent from heaven, and the mystery of His divine being. Though he does not expressly refer to any clause in the Nicene Creed, it is easy to supply instances. Light of light (φῶς ἐκ φωτός), that is, Light proceeding from light, is a beautiful phrase which is derived from the later Platonists, and is found almost exactly in the fifth Ennead of Plotinus. There, as elsewhere, it implies the subordination of the second person to the first. Yet in the Nicene Creed it is made parallel with 'very God of very God,' which denies subordination.

'Begotten, not made,' is also a Platonic phrase. *Begotten* is constantly used in Plotinus to express the relation of the second person of his trinity to the first. But what does it mean? Neither in Plotinus nor in Christian theology can it be understood in any but a remotely metaphorical sense.

To the uninstructed Christian such language can hardly be said to have any meaning at all. To the instructed, who knows something of its source in a philosophy which has been long extinct, it suggests thoughts about the continuity of human speculation about the divine,; it adds an element of poetry to his profession of faith: but its phrases on his lips are in no sense definitions, but rather symbols of a mystery which he dimly discerns.

About the Christological language of the Nicene Creed, then, we are all agreed. It must be understood symbolically, and no man is expected to give it a literal interpretation. But there is no such agreement about certain clauses which refer to events in the past.

Let me name the simplest example first. The phrase, 'according to the Scriptures,' in the Nicene Creed, amounts to an assertion that our Lord's resurrection was foretold in the Old Testament. We are all familiar with the proof texts which are quoted in the Acts: and I doubt if there is any serious student who believes that they can possibly bear the meaning which is there assigned to them. We know that the only certain references to a resurrection are in Daniel xii and Isaiah xxvi, neither of which passages were remotely Messianic, and that the only two psalms (49 and 73) in which any scholars find such a reference are purely individual. Yet we can assent to the phrase in the creed, because we see in the Resurrection the fulfilment of desires and aspirations whose growth we have traced in the Old Testament Scriptures. Surely symbolic interpretation is no less admissible here than in the cases already mentioned.

The original form of the Nicene Creed, which alone has the authority of the Council of Nicaea, does not contain the clause, *And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, but only *was incarnate*. It would be a quibble to urge that, since the clause has not the authority of the Council of Nicaea behind it, we need not regard it as having the authority of the Church. But if we try to see what the Council of Constantinople in 451 meant by adding the words which are so familiar to us, we may gain an answer to the question: What interpretations of them are legitimate?

(*a*) Scholars are generally agreed that the words were inserted as a protest against Docetism. The point which it was desired to emphasize was our Lord's birth from a human mother: and the epithet Virgin came in as a matter of course, being what in Homer we call a standing epithet. The Council intended to assert the Lord's real and substantial humanity.

(*b*) A second object was to proclaim the truth, recognized by the first generation of disciples, that Christ came in the

fulness of time to realize those higher hopes and aspirations of the Hebrews, which are expressed by the term Messianic. By the error of an unscholarly generation, this belief was linked with a misinterpretation of the seventh chapter of Isaiah. If anything is certain in the field of literary criticism it is that, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive,' is a double mistranslation of the Hebrew. But the epithet may claim to hold its place as a symbol of the truth that the birth of Jesus was the far-off divine event towards which the whole Hebrew revelation moved.

(*c*) A third reason for adopting the clause was the belief that the virginity of the mother guaranteed the sinlessness of the Son. The thought has been expressed in a modern catch-word, 'cutting off the entail of sin.' The Anglican Church has stopped at that point. The Roman Church, more logical, has pursued that line of speculation further. The next step was the assertion that the Virgin must have been born sinless—the immaculate conception. This is now seen to involve the virginity of Anna, the mother of Mary, who is in process of being canonised. Obviously it is a case for infinite regression. Some future Pope may have to consider the claims of Eve. Surely such wanderings of a materialistic fancy can but dishonour Him who could say, 'Which of you convinceth me of sin?' Surely those who regard the word virgin, in this connection, as a symbol of the Lord's absolute purity, are nearer to truth and reverence than those who give a physiological explanation of His sinlessness.

(*d*) In the fifth century, when this clause was officially adopted, virginity was the object of an unreasonable homage. A generation which was degraded by a frenzy of sexual passion regarded continence as a thing so difficult as to be almost divine, and certainly as the equivalent of all virtue. But that was a diseased phase of human history, outside its normal movement. Those of us who believe that marriage is a better guarantee than celibacy for purity of mind feel that by reverencing the Lord's mother as the most highly favoured of matrons we come nearest to the homage which a former age designed to express by the epithet virgin.

(*e*) All these considerations are incomplete until they are put into relation with the words *incarnate by the Holy Ghost.*

What did the Council of Constantinople mean to express by those words? They had got past the stage of thought which we find in Justin Martyr, who was both troubled and tempted by analogies from Greek mythology. They founded themselves upon the formulas of St. Luke and St. Paul, which were essentially Jewish. St. Luke writes: 'He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David.' St. Paul expresses the same thought in clearer language when he writes to the Romans that Jesus was physically (*κατὰ σαρκά*) of the seed of David, but spiritually (*κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*) the Son of God. That is to say, He was complete in royal manhood, but the divine spark (*πνεῦμα*) which normally burns low in the soul of man, was in Him a holy flame possessing the whole soul. We don't consider St. Paul a heretic: yet he plainly had no idea of any abnormal birth. Is it not lawful for the disciples to go behind the words of the creed to the reality which the apostle was able to affirm without their aid?

So far I have been trying to show that in the case of the Virgin Birth, no less than in that of the Ascension, it is possible for a man to hold firmly the religious truth which the words of the creed were intended to enshrine without literally accepting the words themselves. If that be true, such a man may rightly claim that he holds the Catholic faith.

But certain clauses of the creed, especially that which refers to the birth of our Lord, demand belief in a definite physical miracle. Obviously we must consider very seriously the relation of such miracles to our faith. Two questions at least must be asked and answered.

(*a*) Is the evidence for these miracles so convincing that men can rightly be blamed for failing to accept it? I think I may assume your consent to the view that the evidence for a miracle ought to be somewhat stronger than a historian requires before he affirms an event of normal type to have happened. There are two reasons for this. First, a miracle is an event which is produced without any of the causes which alone (as far as we know) do produce its like. It is an exception to the rule of God's normal providence. Secondly, in the ages before

science, the mass of mankind regarded miracle as, so to speak, part of the normal course. The Old Testament contains numerous stories of miracle, which none of us now take seriously. And it is difficult to name any saint of the first five Christian centuries to whom miracles were not attributed. The moral atmosphere was highly favourable to the growth of miraculous stories. For both these reasons the presumption in our minds is against the correctness of such a story, and therefore we rightly demand strong evidence to show that it was not produced by the same causes which have produced so many thousands of tales of wonder—inaccurate observation, misunderstanding of what was seen or told, and a conviction that holy men must work miracles.

The evidence for the Virgin Birth is not exceptionally strong. The Bishop of Ely, who has written a book about it, says expressly, 'The evidence is slight.' Few people, I fancy, realize how slight it is. It consists of two narratives, which can hardly be reconciled with each other, and each of which contains a genealogy which would have no meaning unless Joseph were the actual father of Jesus. On the other hand St. Peter and St. Paul are both reported in the Acts to have used language irreconcilable with the miraculous narrative: and St. Paul wrote to the Romans that Jesus 'was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.' St. Paul may have been quite wrong, and St. Peter also, and St. John may have been wrong in omitting the story from his Gospel, which was written years after St. Matthew's. But dare we say that a man who, after weighing the evidence on either side, finds the balance in favour of the miracle too slight to overcome the presumption against it, is sinning against the light? Dare we condemn as a heretic the man who believes that, without the mediation of physical wonders, God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself?

(*b*) The second question which demands an answer is this. Granting that the evidence for a particular miracle convinces us of its reality, what does it prove? Obviously it proves the possession of power. But is it a proof of goodness? The Hebrews did not think so—Pharaoh's magicians wrought many

of the same miracles as Moses. The Jews did not think so: for they ascribed our Lord's miracles to the power of Beelzebub. The mediaeval Christians did not think so: for they had endless tales of the wonders wrought by devils. The ancient Greeks and Romans did not think so: for they attributed such powers chiefly to witches and magicians—the basest of mankind. Do we think so? Let us try for a moment to get so far outside our traditional selves as to see familiar things from a fresh point of view. If you saw a man restore life in one who was undoubtedly dead, would your impulse be to worship him as divine? Would you not rather wait to see what purpose he seemed to be serving thereby? You would not worship him until something quite distinct from the act of power had proved him to be good. In other words, you do not accept miracle as a proof of divinity. What does that involve? The abnormal claims belief: but it is the normal which inspires faith. Consciously or unconsciously men of our generation are learning to see God, not in the gaps, as our ancestors did, but in the whole order of the world. Changing knowledge of Nature and changing conceptions of evidence have altered, and may still alter our belief about particular events and their significance. But the tendency of all such changes heretofore has been to enrich the faith which is expressed in the first sentence of our creed—love and trust in the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

Wonderful is the power of words, both for good and for ill! How much theology has been determined by the fact that the Greeks had only one word for two things so different as faith and belief—one noun, πίστις, and one verb, πιστεύω,—and consequently never quite realised the difference! Latin writers were subject to the same disability: for they had only *fides* and *credo*.[1] English does possess two nouns—*faith* and *belief*—which are quite adequate to mark the distinction. But English writers have been, and still are, hampered by the confusion inherited from Greek and Latin theology. Moreover, though they have two nouns, they have only one verb—to believe: and ideas which are coupled in the verb can scarcely be clearly separated in the nouns.

[1] *Cf.* Augustine's *De Spiritu et Littera*, cap. xxxi.

CHURCH BELLS AND CAMPANOLOGY

By Canon T. L. Papillon, sometime Fellow of New College, Oxford, late Vicar of Writtle, Essex, and Master of the Essex Association of Change Ringers.

WHAT has such a subject as this to do with Modernist or Liberal Churchmen? It is a detail of 'ecclesiology,' a branch of practical Church work for which we are credited with caring nothing in our so-called academic isolation from the realities of Church life—we, the 'sterile party,' barren of useful fruit for religion or for the Church, mere intellectuals, destructive rather than constructive reformers. To many, perhaps to the majority, of our fellow Churchmen we are very far from saints. But we have one thing in common with the saints of the Church from apostolic times onward, a plentiful crop of false legends is growing up about us: one of which is that we take no interest in matters ecclesiastical, or in the practical work of the Church.

Now, the use of church bells, and the position of church bell-ringers, is a detail of practical church work that may well interest such Modernist Churchmen (let us hope an increasing number) who have or may have charge of a parish in which there is a good ring of bells. Of all the 'goods of the church' for which clergy and churchwardens are responsible, least is known about and least interest taken in the church bells. Far out of sight in windy heights of church towers, inaccessible, through ignorance or carelessness of church architects, to all but active climbers, they hang from year to year unvisited save by bats and jackdaws. The sexton or other official, whose duty it is to see that the bells are kept in order for use, saves himself all the trouble that he can: churchwardens and clergy, if middle-aged or portly, seldom risk the perilous climb to see for themselves that things are right: and so the process of neglect goes on, till some day it is discovered that the bells have become unringable or dangerous. A little ordinary care and a small annual expense would have kept them in order: but things have gone too far, and a large sum of money has to be

raised for re-hanging and general repair. Even then there is a further risk that ignorance may take refuge in false economy. Bell-hanging is a special trade, requiring highly skilled and experienced workmen; and to allow the local ironmonger or blacksmith to undertake repairs is to court disaster. I know a parish where, on its being found necessary to re-hang the bells, an estimate was procured from a leading firm of bell-hangers, which rather staggered the church authorities. A local man, they thought, would do the work 'as well as them Londoners' for less than two-thirds of the cost: so the order was given to him, and the parish rejoiced. Then came the day of re-opening the bells. A band of expert change-ringers, invited for the occasion, soon found that nothing could be done; the bells were unringable as a peal. In the end the work had to be done over again by the firm that had first tendered, and much of the expense already incurred had been thrown away.

Closely connected with ignorance and neglect of church bells by church authorities, is their neglect of and indifference to those who ring them, and to the art of change-ringing whereby the best use is made of them. It is not the purpose of this article to give any technical account of change-ringing. For that I may be permitted to refer to an article, 'Bell,' contributed by me to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th Edition). I will only say here that it is a fascinating art, easily acquired when the preliminary difficulty of handling and managing a bell has been surmounted, and only requiring patience, perseverance and close attention for its practice in the belfry. In a country parish the belfry may be an admirable school of discipline for qualities in which country folk are specially apt to be deficient —perseverance in work or play, 'give and take' in association with others, steadiness, good temper, and sobriety. Once get a band of ringers up to a certain point of skill in ringing, and inspired with ambition to progress in their art, there is *ipso facto* a strong antidote to the public-house and the constant tippling which, though it stops short of drunkenness, so often muddles or bemuses the rural brain. No man can hold his own in change-ringing if eye or brain are clouded, or hand unsteadied by two much beer: and the gradual recognition of this fact, in many a parish where change-ringing has been

ıtroduced, has put an end to old scandals whereby bell-ringers ere regarded as parochial black sheep, ringing the church ells, even for divine service, as anything but church work, and ıe belfry as an adjunct to the pot-house. When I was a boy, hange-ringing used to be recorded in *Bell's Life* and other porting papers, in company with skittles, rabbit coursing, and mysterious game called 'knur and spell': it ranked among ow-class amusements. When, at the age of forty-three, I took p change-ringing in order to revive the ringing art and reform ıe belfry in the parish to which I had been appointed vicar, found that the ringers were—well, not the most respectable ıembers of our community, and I had to begin by refusing to llow new handbells, procured for use in belfry practice, to be aken afterwards to the public-houses. There being, fortuately, no regular payment for the ringers, the older ones soon ropped off in disapproval of the new *régime*, and left us a lear field for a fresh start. I say fortunately, for sooner or ater I should have had to dismiss some of them, at the risk f unpopularity in the parish and consequent hindrance to the ork of belfry reform. Enough, however, of personal experince: I only cite it as showing that church bells and their ngers may well engage the interest of any clergyman, who is ot a born opponent of change and reform, as a matter of ractical parish politics—not merely of 'the parish pump' rder. He will find, too, that a flowing tide is with him; that ings are moving all along the line, and that the old bad days f neglect and discredit are gone—it may be hoped for ever.

That this can now be said is due largely to a revival of the rt of change-ringing, which has led to the formation of many iocesan or county societies for its encouragement and for the eform of belfries. Where clergy and church authorities have een apathetic, they have been stirred from below by ringers ıemselves. Cathedral bodies—never very conspicuous in the an of reform—are much less open than formerly to the eproach of bad example to the parish churches of a diocese ı respect to their bells; even Westminster Abbey, long a byord among ringers, having been aroused by national feeling) put its bells in proper order for the celebration of great ational events. A 'Central Council of Church Bell-ringers,'

composed of delegates from associations all over the country representing, it is estimated, thirty or forty thousand ringers, meets annually in London or at some provincial centre for the discussion of matters concerning the ringers' art, *e.g.* the dissemination of knowledge in regard to the art itself, the proper care of bells and belfries, or the best means of diminishing without silencing the sound of bells in crowded neighbourhoods, with possible annoyance to invalids or lovers of quiet: on which, as on many other points of campanology, the deepest ignorance prevails, not only among the general public, but among architects and well-meaning enthusiasts for the preservation of ancient buildings. This Central Council has already done great service to 'the Exercise' (a term denoting ringers as a body and the general interests of ringing), and there is much more work ready to its hand.

That church bells should be silenced, few Englishmen would desire. They are too closely identified with English popular life. The 'sound of the church-going bell,' familiar to many from childhood, has in it a suggestion of home, and to those who have lived within sound of a melodious peal, its absence may aggravate the bitterness of exile. Bells, indeed, have from early times in England been associated with the life of the people. We still expect them to ring cheerily at a wedding and toll slowly, or with muffled sound for a funeral: and the 'passing bell,' no longer as a rule at the time of death, but shortly after it, is in general use. We can appreciate the fine effect of Milton's sonorous lines:

> 'Oft, on a plot of rising ground,
> I hear the far-off curfew sound
> Over some wide-watered shore,
> Swinging slow with sullen roar';

or Shakespeare's image of 'the first bringer of unwelcome news':

> 'His tongue
> Sounds ever after a sullen bell
> Remember'd knelling a departing friend.'

The curfew survives here and there by force of custom, though its meaning is lost. The 'harvest' or 'gleaning' bells, to call

labourers and gleaners into the fields, have not long disappeared from some country parishes. The 'market bell,' originally a signal to begin selling, so as to guard against forestalling, is (or was till recently) rung at noon on market days at Oundle. The 'fire-bell' is still not uncommon, as I can personally testify from experience at Adderbury, in Oxfordshire, where the then vicar, on showing me his belfry, gave me leave to try one of the bells. But after I had pulled it off two or three times, he remembered that this particular bell was the fire bell! The parish had lately started a fire brigade, which only waited for an opportunity to justify its existence, and he was barely in time to stop the men from leaving their work and hurrying to the *rendezvous*. Other old bell customs have disappeared, *e.g.* the 'storm' or 'tempest' bell, to ward off lightning—perhaps from the supposed power of bells to drive away evil spirits; the 'oven bell,' to announce that the manor oven, to which tenants had to bring their bread, was heated; or the 'pancake bell' on Shrove Tuesday as a signal to housewives to use up their grease and dripping before the Lenten fast. In old belfries here and there may be found quaint metrical rules for the ringers, according to most of which fines were levied for swearing, wearing hat or spurs (presumably regarded as objectionable swagger), or for 'over-throwing' a bell, *e.g.*:

> 'If you ring in spur or hat,
> Sixpence you must pay for that:
> And if a bell you overthrow,
> Pray pay a groat before you go.'

Strange tales are told of belfry manners and customs within living memory, of carousals in the ringing chamber itself, which no one ever thought of regarding as part of God's House; of a new bell, brought into the church before being hung in the steeple, placed upside down and filled with beer for general consumption; of 'peals' or 'touches' breaking down because one or other of the ringers was too far 'on' to manage his bell, or keep his place in the changes. But such things are now ancient history, deservedly forgotten, except so far as their evil memory has made the reform of ringers and of ringing slower and more difficult than it need have been. Yet after all, reform

has not been very slow. It has come about within the last fifty years; and what makes it surer is that it has been largely the work of ringers themselves, under the inspiration of a comparatively few earnest ringing clergy: one of whom especially deserves remembrance, the late Rev. F. E. Robinson, Vicar of Drayton, near Abingdon, in Oxfordshire. I could name a dozen others, but they would all agree to yield pride of place to him.

Change-ringing on tower bells is, I believe, peculiar to England or English colonies. The Belgian 'carillons,' of which the late Mr. Haweis was an enthusiastic advocate, have taken no firm root in this country. Their use is for tune-playing from church towers, a purpose for which they far surpass the melancholy attempt at hymn tunes sometimes heard from an English tower. These, of course, are limited to the notes available from eight, ten, or twelve bells as the case may be: whereas in a carillon such as hangs (or used to hang) in the cathedral tower at Antwerp, there are over ninety bells ranging from the size of a school or dinner bell to bells of several hundredweight. These are struck by hammers from outside, not by clappers inside the bell, the mechanism of which is connected with a keyboard, at which sits the 'carilloneur,' a personage of high honour at Antwerp or Bruges. Enthusiasts for carillon music have the opportunity at any rate once a year in England, when M. Denyn, a famous Belgian expert, gives a demonstration of his art on the carillon at Catistock, in Dorsetshire. Such bell-music is no doubt beautiful as it floats over 'some wide-watered shore' of the Low Countries, but it will never supersede the music of a well-struck peal from English towers.

Now I must end this discursive and, I fear, inadequate attempt to deal with a fascinating subject that is still too much 'caviare to the general' among English church people. If I can induce any reader of the *Modern Churchman* to think it not unworthy of his or her attention (for some ladies are now bell-ringers), I shall not have wasted my own time or the editor's space.

THE INCARNATION—THE CRUX OF THE PROBLEM

By the Rev. F. A. M. Spencer, M.A., Author of *The Meaning of Christianity and Human Ideals.*

II.

THE article in the May number of the *Modern Churchman* bearing the above title should help to clear the ground for the discussions concerning the Person of our Lord that are to take place at the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Girton. I wish to make the issue still plainer by suggesting considerations which Mr. Charles Howe seems to have overlooked. As I understand him, he has found the traditional conception of the Divinity of Christ hard to accept. The traditional conception seems to him to be this: Christ is an Eternal Divine Person, equal, though subordinate, to the God whom He revealed to us; for the salvation and spiritual progress of mankind He appeared in human form as Jesus of Nazareth. For this he would substitute the following: There is a Divine Principle of Action, called the Logos, not a Person, in the sense of an individual consciousness, though perhaps to be called personal, in the sense of being a mode of God's Personality. The Logos works and dwells in all men in greater or less degree, but worked and dwelt in Jesus in a superlative or even perfect degree, so that in Jesus we can see what the Logos, and indeed what God essentially is, namely, Love. The Person of Jesus was finite, as the persons of all other men, though far greater; but because of His perfect harmony with the will of God, he is for the human race the authoritative representation of God. God is a Person; Jesus was a Person; men are persons. The Logos is not a Person in Himself, but rather a spiritual emanation of the Person of God. Jesus is finite; God is infinite.

Professor Kirsopp Lake, in *The Stewardship of Faith*, suggests a similar Christology. He would transfer to the Logos the worship which Christians have accorded to Jesus. *The New Theology*, by Dr. R. J. Campbell—now, I understand, withdrawn from circulation—expressed practically this.

The majority of the more advanced Liberal Christians seem to hold some such doctrine.

Some would call this Unitarian, and it is probable that most Unitarians would accept it, or something like it. Yet it is not in harmony with the older type of Unitarianism, which was Deistic, and thought of God as separate from the world. Nor is it Arianism, since Arius denied that Christ was of one substance with the Father, whereas this doctrine strongly affirms the spiritual union and oneness of God and Jesus, and also the potential union and oneness of God with all men.

In fact, the doctrine rests upon the revelation of God given in the New Testament: God is love, Jesus was love. Therefore we affirm of Jesus absolutely and without reserve that He is very God of very God, and of one substance with the Father. The question then arises whether there is any need to retain the conception of the Logos. Why not merely say that God dwelt in Jesus supremely and dwells in other men in various degrees? Is not the Logos merely a hypostatization of our belief that God is always working in the world and always revealing Himself to His children? Or do we need the Logos-doctrine to express our sense of the transcendence of the Almighty, that He not only works and dwells in us and in creation, but also exists for Himself apart? But whether we do or do not believe in the Logos, does not affect our belief in the full Divinity of Jesus and in the potential Divinity of all human beings. God is love. Jesus is love. We are called to be love also.

This is a creed both profound and simple. It penetrates into the central mystery of the Universe; it lifts up our hearts in prayer and praise to Our Father; it has immediate bearing upon the common facts and difficulties of this world; it is not beyond the comprehension of a child. And I would plead that whatever further interpretation any may give of the doctrine of the Divinity or the Deity of Christ, at least none may refuse communion or Christian fellowship to one who holds only this, or deny him the right to minister to others as a priest in the Church of Christ. We have made so many mistakes and have sinned so many times both against truth and charity, we still know so little and find it so difficult to prove what appears to be true, that we should rejoice to meet with so great a measure

of community in belief: God is love. Jesus was love. He showed us how we might become love also, and therefore, like Him, perfect children of the perfect God.

Yet one believing this to be the whole doctrine concerning Christ, must disapprove of much that is most appealing and uplifting in religion to-day. Would people sing, 'Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear,' or 'Jesus, Lover of my soul,' with such feeling of comfort and peace, if by 'Saviour' and 'Jesus' they meant the Logos? And should we take away from our children the hymn beginning 'There's a Friend for little children'? Must we empty of its natural meaning the sublime words, 'Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy-laden'? The thought of the friendship of Jesus, His sympathy and help, with the hope of one day seeing Him and being commended by Him, is too valuable as a sustaining factor in life to be lightly discarded. Of course it will be said that wishing to believe consitutes no argument, and that in the history of religion many beautiful illusions, such as the romantic figures and tales of Greek deities, have passed away. Still, if belief in the friendship of the living Jesus has great spiritual value, and if God be wise and good, there is at least a presumption in its favour.

But, it might be more reasonably argued, the true substitute for Jesus-worship is not Logos-worship, but the worship of the Heavenly Father. God Himself should mean to us all what Jesus means. We can sing, 'Father, Lover of my soul.' Perhaps; and yet the idea of Someone who has had actual human experience of the difficulties and perplexities and sorrows of human life makes a special appeal. For most people the thought of God is too vast and overwhelming to have precisely the comforting and stimulating force that attaches to the Man Jesus. Certainly God knows all about us and sympathizes and helps; but it is easier for us to imagine and make real to our consciousness the One of whom we read in the Gospels. Or rather, love for our Saviour leads us on to love for our Heavenly Father.

Early Christianity throve and conquered by its belief in the living Jesus, who was to come again and complete the work He had begun: St. Stephen at his death had a vision of Jesus in heaven: St. Paul believed that Jesus spoke to him when he was on the road to Damascus and changed the whole tenour of

his career, and more than once spoke to him in person (Acts xvi, 18; xviii, 9; xxii, 18; xxiii, 11). And it seems that Jesus thought of Himself as holding a position of great eminence in the Divine order of things, if we judge only from such passages as these in the Synoptic Gospels: 'No man knoweth who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him.' 'Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven.' 'All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth.'

The outstanding religious problem as to the Person of Christ is that of the continued life of Jesus and His present relation to us. Does He know about each of us in our difficulties and strivings? Can He, does He, help us individually? Shall we ever know Him personally, and will He recognise us? The question is not now whether Jesus was or is of one substance with the Father. To that we can answer boldly, 'Yes, since God is love, and Jesus is love.' And consequently each of us may look forward to being able to say, 'I and my Father are one.' Nor is it a question as to the place of Jesus in the Godhead. Astronomy has made the acceptance of the traditional doctrine on that subject very difficult. Has Jesus been suffering and dying on others of the many millions of worlds, and will He continue to do so? If not, why should our globe be singled out as the only one for the Son of God to visit? Perhaps the Logos-doctrine may help us here, since we may suppose innumerable Incarnations of a Divine Principle which is spiritual without being a Person. It is enough for us if 'for this world the Word of God is Christ.'

We crave to know whether Jesus is of such spiritual greatness as to be able to have spiritual intimacy with all who truly believe on Him. We can but answer, His is no ordinary personality; He stands for the human race as the typical representative of God and of Sonship to God. If we take Him as that, we can hardly refuse to entertain the idea that, before His birth into this world, He may have been great in the spiritual world (Philippians ii, 6). We need not even deride the suggestion that He may have had some function in creation (Colossians i, 16). Now, however, He has thrown in His lot with humanity. He has had human experience and is one of us, and, owing to His greatness and His closeness to God, He

is able to help us in our growth and our labours as no other man could. He is the Leader of humanity into the Kingdom of God.

Is this an incredible doctrine? It would justify those various sayings attributed to Jesus (whether He actually said them does not concern us now): 'I and My Father are one.' 'My Father is greater than I.' 'Lo! I am with you always.'

It may be the function of Liberal Churchmen to discern the truth for which Catholics and Unitarians respectively have contended, and to unite them in a higher synthesis.

THE PRE-CHRISTIAN IDEA OF CHRIST*

By Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B.

THE early Christians probably had lists of passages from the Old Testament, which they regarded as referring to the Messiah.

Edersheim, at the close of his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, gives a list of passages which the Rabbis regarded as Messianic in some way. We can be sure that in the century prior to our era there was such a list among pious Jews, for the New Testament use of the Old Testament implies the compilation of such a list not as a recent production, but as well known, as a list that could be used and appealed to for argument. When we come to compile such a list we find the following passages to our hand in the New Testament. The references are given in a footnote.

'There shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him. A virgin shall conceive and bear a son. Thou Bethlehem, out of thee shall come forth unto me one that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting. When Israel was a child, I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. The voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of the Lord. Behold I send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before Me.'

'The Lord said unto me, Thou are my son: this day have I begotten thee. The Lord hath annointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek, to comfort all that mourn.'

* In view of the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Girton College on August 8th—15th, we publish these two short articles dealing with the Christological question. Our object in publishing them is not to commend this article or that to our readers as *de fide*, but merely to call attention, as a preliminary to discussion, to the varied views of thoughtful and reverent modern-minded Christians.—Ed., *M.C.*

'Saith the Lord, I will make a new covenant . . . I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it' (see Sermon on the Mount).

'I swear not by any oath, neither by heaven, nor by earth, but yea, yea: nay, nay.'

'Enter thou into thy chamber, shut thy doors.'

'Hide not your silver in the earth.'

'What thou thyself hatest, do thou to no man.'

'Depart from me all ye workers of iniquity.'

'Behold, your God will come and save you. Then the eyes of the (spiritually) *blind* shall be opened, and the ears of the *deaf* shall be unstopped. Then shall the *lame* man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the *dumb* shall sing.' 'The tongue of the *stammerers* shall be ready to speak plainly.'

'Twenty loaves of barley, give unto the people, that they may eat, for thus saith the Lord: They shall eat and shall leave thereof.'

'When thou passeth through the waters (of trouble) I will be with thee.'

'He maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still.'

'Mine elect One will sit on the throne of glory. The Son of Man hath righteousness.'

'The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up.'

'Rejoice, O daughter of Zion, thy king cometh unto thee: lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass.' (Matthew xxi, 7, has both animals, supposing two were meant!)

'Mine own familiar friend, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.'

'They weighed for my hire thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said, Cast it unto the potter' (Syriac: into the treasury; both versions are used in Matthew xxvii, 6, 7).

'The rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his Anointed.'

'I have trodden the wine-press alone: and of the peoples there was no man with me.'

'His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives.'

'Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.'

'False witnesses are risen up against me.'

'I gave my back to the smiters. I hid not my face from shame and spitting.'

'He was despised and rejected of men . . . He opened not his mouth. As a lamb that is led to the slaughter, he opened not his mouth. He was wounded for our transgressions. He was numbered with the transgressors.'

'All they that see me laugh me to scorn. They shake the head saying, Let Him deliver him (Matthew xxvii, 39). They part my garments among them, and upon my vesture do they cast lots.'

'*Eloi, Eloi, lama sabacthani.*'

'They say unto me, Aha, Aha.'

'They made his grave with the rich.'

'After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him.'

'My servant shall be lifted up.'

'Thou hast ascended on high. Thou hast received gifts among men.'[1]

[1] Isaiah xi, 1; vii, 14; Micah v, 3; Hosea xi, 1; Isaiah xl, 3; Malachi iii, 1; Ps. ii, 7; xxxvii, 2; Is. lxi, 1, 2; Jerem. xxxi, 31—34; Secrets of Enoch xlix, 1; Is. xxvi, 20; Tobit iv, 15; Is., xxxv, 5, 6;

xxxii, 4; II. Kings iv, 42-44; Is. xliii, 1, 2; Dan. vii, 13; Enoch xlv, 3; xlvi, 3; Ps. lxix, 9; Zech. ix, 9, 10; Ps. xli, 9; Zech. xi, 12, 13; Ps. ii, 2; Is. lxiii, ; Zech. xiv, 4; xiii, 7; Ps. xxvii, 12; Is. l, 6; liii, 12, 7; liii, 5; Ps. xxii, 7; xl, 15; xx, 18; Is. liii, 9; Hos. vi, 3; Is. lii, 13; Ps. lxviii, 18.

Such was the pre-Christian picture or story of the Christ, whom *The Book of Enoch* said was alive in heaven, and about to come as Judge.

From the book *Poimandres*, and the *Naasene Document*, we know that, at the beginning of our era, and before it, there were Jewish Gnostics of Alexandria who taught that the Logos or Primal Man, the outgoing life of God, *had descended* to live in souls and lift them up to heaven. This Logos was now called the 'Christ' also, and so came the new Christ-sect among the Jews, whose inner message, for the initiates, was that in them lived the 'Christ' or Ideal life of God: and that He would soon be openly manifested to condemn the Roman oppressors and all evil-doers (see Enoch xlvii, 3; lxii, 5, 7).

The Gnostics spoke of the Eternal, subject to the limitations of Matter, as 'crucified'; and they pictured the Christ-Logos as crucified in the universe, or in the heavens, in order that He might reach and save men and live in them.

The pre-Christian picture of 'Christ' became, it seems, the garment or form for this Gnostic idea of the descended, crucified and risen Saviour, or Primal Man divine. The Primal Man was said, by the Christians, after A.D. 70 (destruction of Jerusalem), to have once lived here as if *a* man, or rather in the 'similitude' and 'semblance' of man (Philippians ii, 5—8).

The Old Testament and Enochian story was used to describe the Primal Man whom the Gnostics said had descended, and whom they felt in their souls. As against the formalism of the Pharisees, the Christians felt the Jewish Inner Ideal of humility, sincerity, magnanimity, and consequent glad faith or trust in the Divine Life, whose will was thus unveiled in souls. This saving Ideal they called 'Christ in you, the hope of glory' (Col. i, 29).

Thus Christianity was the product of the Gnostic gospel united to the Jewish Messianic predictions, and used to describe and interpret the Infinite Life who is ever expressing Himself in men, and is actually felt in souls as they obey His Ideal Will.

THE LAST OF THE ROMANS

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A.

THE spectacle of the last landmarks of culture being overwhelmed under a flood of barbarism is a melancholy one. This was the experience of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, who had the misfortune to be born towards the close of the fifth century, A.D., which was either five centuries too late, or a thousand years too early.

The father of Boethius had held consular rank, and he himself attained that dignity in the year 510 A.D. under Theodoric the Ostrogoth, who, according to Gibbon, 'might have deserved a statue among the best and bravest of the ancient Romans.'[1] This successful barbarian had erected a military despotism on the ruins of Italy, and inaugurated a generation of peace and commercial prosperity (493—526). Like all methodical autocrats, he made a careful choice of the best talent available to serve him; and his own lack of education (though brought up as a hostage at the court of Constantinople, he could not sign his own name[2]) did not blind him to the importance and utility of intellectual attainments. Amongst the highly capable circle of civil servants at the court of Ravenna were Cassiodorus, the historian, and Boethius, the philosopher.

Boethius was said, on incomplete authority, to have studied for eighteen years in the school of Proclus at Athens; he may have sojourned in that city, and certainly his knowledge of Greek philosophic literature was both wide and accurate. He laboured, with as much success as ever attends an impossible enterprise, to reconcile the divergencies of Plato and Aristotle. Euclid's geometry, the music of Pythagoras, the arithmetic of Nichomachus, the mechanics of Archimedes and the astronomy of Ptolemy were translated and commented upon by him. Certain works of controversial theology—against the Arian, Eutychian and Nestorian heresies—have also been attributed

[1] *Decline and Fall*, Ch. xxxix.

[2] 'The first four letters of his name (ΘΕΟΔ) were inscribed on a gold plate, and when it was fixed on the paper the King drew his pen through the intervals.'—Gibbon.

o Boethius, of which the authenticity, long and not unnaturally doubted, may now have been established by the discovery in a Reichenau MS. of a direct testimony cited from a lost work of Cassiodorus, the contemporary of Boethius himself: '*Scripsit ibrum de Sancta trinitate et capita quaedam dogmatica et ibrum contra Nestorium.*'[3]

It is difficult to understand how so conscientious and upright a public servant as Boethius lost the confidence of Theodoric, who was a good judge of men, and an enlightened, vigorous and efficient ruler. The causes of the philosopher's political downfall must remain obscure. The charge was one of complicity in a conspiracy to invite Justinian, the Emperor of the East, to deliver Italy from Arianism and the Goths: but the characters of his two *delators* seem not to have been above suspicion, and he himself protests his innocence in the *Consolation*. Yet the confidence of the Emperor, who was not a capricious character, can hardly have been lost suddenly, and perhaps Boethius had weakened his own position by advocating the impracticable policies of a philosophical *doctrinaire;* or is it possible that the poison of theological bigotry had invaded so steadily-balanced and acute a mind? If Boethius was the author of the Theological Tractates, and was the confidant of prelates, he might have become, all unconsciously, the tool of an ecclesiastical faction, and have played into the hands of those for whom the virtues and the sagacity of Theodoric were no compensation for his heresy. Gibbon, who is not always so charitable, does not care to accept this latter view, but inclines rather to think that Boethius was generously over-zealous for establishing Plato's Republic in sixth-century Italy. Yet Gibbon, we must remember, did not recognise, as most modern

[3] See Wicksteed, *Reactions between Dogma and Philosophy* (1920), p. 90. H. O. Taylor in his *Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages* (note on p. 501), accepts the authenticity of the Theological Tractates, as also H. F. Stewart in his Introductory Essay to the Loeb Edition of *Tractates* and the Consolation. C. C. J. Webb in *Studies in the History of Natural Theology* (note on p. 222), says 'he may quite possibly have been the author' of the Treatise on the Trinity. On the other hand, the writer of the unsigned article on Boethius in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* seems to regard all these works as spurious. Jourdain conjectures that they may have been written by one Boethius, a Bishop of Africa. Nitzsch holds the passage in the Reichenau MS. to be a copyist's gloss, harmonising with the received Boethius legend.

scholars seem to recognise, that Boethius was a Christian and intimate with orthodox divines.

Be this as it may, the fall of the minister and his imprisonment at Pavia, have given us 'a golden volume which claims incomparable merit from the barbarism of the times and the situation of its author.' For here, while he awaited execution, which is said, perhaps erroneously, to have been performed with revolting barbarity, Boethius composed his *Consolation of Philosophy*.

The book, which is written both in prose and verse, takes the form of a dialogue between Philosophy and the Sufferer, who records his acts of integrity, and points, like Job, to his reward:

> 'How often have I protected, by putting my authority in danger, such poor wretches as the unpunished covetousness of the barbarous did vex with infinite reproaches? Never did any man draw me from right to wrong.' And now 'good men lie prostrate with the terror or my danger, and every lewd fellow is provoked by impunity to attempt any wickedness.'

Philosophy, in her turn, appeals to his faith in the divine governance of the world, and reminds him that he has done more than his share of good things:

> 'Didst thou not learn in thy youth that there lay two barrels, the one of good things, the other of bad, at Jupiter's threshold?[4] What if thou hast tasted more abundantly of the good?'

Boethius replies, in words that were afterwards used by the mystic, Richard Rolle, that the most unhappy kind of misfortune is to have been happy.[5] The answer is the Stoic dogma that nothing is, but thinking makes it so.

> 'Nothing is miserable but what is thought so, and contrariwise, every estate is happy if he that bears it be content. . . . Wherefore, O mortal men, why seek for your felicity abroad when it is placed within yourslves?'

Philosophy passes on to expound the nature of the true good, of which the majority (who, 'like drunken men, know not the way home') are ignorant. Riches, dignities, kingdoms,

[4] *Iliad* 24, 527.

[5] In omni adversitate fortunae infelicissimum est genus infortunii fuisse felicem.' *Cf.* Rolle's 'nihil infelicius quam fuisse felicem.' Rolle may easily have read the *Consolatio* before writing his *Incendium Amoris*.

glory and pleasures—these can never satisfy: 'Whosoever will remember his lusts shall understand that the end of pleasure is sadness.'

'Habet hoc voluptas omnis
Stimulis agit fruentes.'[6]

These are only bye-paths which lead us astray.

There follows a hymn to the Divine Guide, who will lead their enquiry into truth; it ends with three lines of genuine poetry:

'Tu namque serenum,
Tu requies tranquilla piis, te cernere finis,
Principium, vector, dux, semita, terminus idem.'[7]

May not this be an echo of John xiv, 6, and of Rev. i, 8?

Nor is happiness to be found where men are accustomed to seek it, but only in participation in the Divine Goodness; a blessing which nothing can take away. This also is to be truly human, a thing which the wicked man is not. The extortioner is a wolf, the brawler a dog, the treacherous man a fox, the fearful man a hare, the slow, stupid man 'liveth an ass's life,' and so on. To persist in successful wickedness is the only genuine misery:

> 'To hate the wicked were against reason. For as faintness is a disease of the body, so is vice a sickness of the mind. Wherefore, since we judge those who have corporal infirmities to be rather worthy of compassion than of hatred, much more are they to be pitied, and not abhorred, whose minds are oppressed with wickedness, the greatest malady that may be.'

And as for the philosopher, his trials will prove his temper and metal:

> 'A wise man must be no more troubled when he is assaulted with adversity, than a valiant captain is dismayed at the sound of an alarm. For difficulties are the matter by which the one must extend his glory, and the other increase his wisdom.'

The treatise ends with an expression of faith in the Divine Justice:

> 'There remaineth also a beholder of all things. . . . Neither do we in vain put our hope in God or pray to Him; for if we do this as we ought, we shall not lose our labours or be without effect. Wherefore fly vices, embrace virtues, possess your minds with worthy

[6] 'All pleasure hath this property, she stings them who enjoy her.'

[7] For Thou art their Peace: the tranquil Rest of them that faithfully serve Thee, whose end is to behold Thee. Thou art their Beginning, their Helper, their Guide: Thou art their Pathway and their Goal.'

hopes, offer up humble prayers. There is a great necessity laid upon you since you live under the eyes of a judge who seeth all.'

These extracts from the *Consolatio* may serve to indicate the scope and temper of the book. Yet it is impossible to deny the justice of the verdict which says: 'The *Consolation* of Philosophy is not a Christian work.'[8] It might have issued from the pen of Epictetus. The author makes no reference to the Christian Scriptures, nor to any specific Christian doctrines, and (what is highly significant) he lays no stress on future rewards or punishments. In his hour of need, and at a time which brings sincerity even to the least sincere, Boethius fortifies his soul with Stoicism.[9]

However, the attribution, whether right or wrong, of works on Christian Theology to Boethius had an important result in recommending the *Consolatio* to subsequent generations of Christians, and in blinding them to any lack of theological definiteness in that treatise. During the whole period of the Middle Ages, the work was perhaps only second to Scripture as a source of strength and consolation. It has been called 'the light of a thousand years.' It was translated into the vernacular by Alfred the Great: it was commented on by Asser, his instructor, and by Bishop Grosseteste of Lincoln: German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Greek versions of it had appeared before the end of the fifteenth century: Chaucer translated it before 1382, and of this version an edition was printed by Caxton in 1480. Queen Elizabeth herself is said to have translated it, and perhaps Shakespeare had Boethius in mind when

[8] H. O. Taylor *op. cit.* p. 54. *Cf.* Wicksteed: 'All attempts to detect a Christian tinge or Christian reservations in it have conspicuously failed.' *Op. cit.* p. 43.

[9] Professor Wicksteed draws attention to a similar lack of scriptural allusion in the *Tractates*. Theological problems are here treated without reference to Church or Revelation, but purely as problems of philosophy. Yet Boethius was 'the intimate friend and associate of the great Christian scholars and ecclesiastics of his day.' 'We may suppose that, when he heard controversies as to the nature of the Trinity and the person of Christ, he was struck by the inconclusiveness and philosophic clumsiness of the arguments adduced,' and thought he might do better, and 'threw off these short essays by way of a service to his ecclesiastical friends.' His 'spiritual life had been fed by Plato and Epictetus, but intellectually he may have regarded the Christian system as consistent and satisfactory. 'He had sincerely accepted Christianity without ever having been much moved by it.' *Op. cit.* pp. 42 *f.*

ıe wrote the famous soliloquies of Wolsey and of King Richard II.

As for Boethius' influence upon philosophic thought; as translator into Latin of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, or *Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle*, he bequeathed to the mediaeval scholastics the battle-ground on which Nominalists and Realists disputed together. In this famous passage Porphyry mentions, but declines to discuss, the various theories which have been held as to the philosophic import of *genera* and *species*. Is the individual more real than the genus, or the genus than the individual? together with kindred questions, each of which contains implications which affect our whole view of existence.

Thus the 'last of the Romans' left behind him both a stimulating moral example, and the fertile seeds of future thought.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF RE-UNION

By the Rev. Canon Tollinton, D.D.

'Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself. For my brethren and companions' sakes I will wish thee prosperity.

'The city lieth four square, and the length is as large as the breadth. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal.

'Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.

'That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.'

THAT is the ideal and the vision of what the Church of Christ might be, and it is well that in these familiar words we should remind ourselves of this, before the further discussion of our subject leads us down, as it must, from these ideal heights to the obstinate facts and spiky problems and deep-seated convictions and only too human temperaments with which the question of Re-union, things and men being what things and men are, is inevitably associated. Let us say at

once, and say thankfully, that judging from their Report, and from what else we know, our fathers at Lambeth did not lose sight of this ideal in making their proposals definite. The vision does not wholly vanish, even when the details grow precise, and by common consent the spirit in which the Lambeth suggestions are issued was worthy of the historic and momentous occasion; which is much to say. But it is not with the spirit, but with the details that we are concerned.

Let us begin with three comparisons or contrasts, which can only be drawn in outline, but which may help us to a clearer appreciation of what is proposed. How do the Lambeth resolutions stand as compared with Bishop Gore's book, *The Church and the Ministry;* as compared with Professor Headlam's recent Bampton Lectures; as compared with the Resolutions of the Mansfield Conference of 1920? I am considering only our relations with English Nonconformity. I have no space here to deal with the Eastern Church. Rome is, and seems likely to remain, impossible.

As we all know well, the Lambeth proposals amount to an interchange of commissions. It is proposed that the Bishops and Clergy of our Communion accept from the Non-episcopal Churches such a form of commission or recognition as the authorities of these bodies may desire, and that their ministers should likewise accept a commission through episcopal ordination. Ministers of both Churches would so receive an additional recognition, qualifying them to officiate throughout the whole fellowship. It is expressly stated that such an acceptance of a wider commission should not be understood as a repudiation by any minister of his ministry in the past. Further, in prospect, if there be prospect, of such re-union, it is suggested, and the suggestion is important, that a bishop should be justified in giving occasional authorisation to ministers not yet episcopally ordained to preach in churches in his diocese —not, be it noted, to administer the Holy Communion—and *vice versa* as regards his own clergy. Also, and this again is important, that any bishop who, in the interim period, countenances the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptised but unconfirmed communicants of non-episcopal congregations

nall not be deemed liable to have his action questioned. For-ive me for reminding you of these familiar details. They are ne distinctive elements in the proposals.

Bishop Gore's well-known book, published in 1888, but ppearing in a new edition in 1919, is the standard expression f what we may call the Anglo-Catholic view. Apostolic suc-ession, episcopal ordination as essential, a ministry in some ense sacerdotal, these are fundamental in the Christian hurch. They are matters of its *esse*, not of its *bene esse* lone. The theory is maintained with all the learning and all ne candour which are characteristic of the Bishop. It is quite gid. It definitely invalidates non-episcopal ministries. With uite sincere and quite generous recognition of the grace that as been given to non-episcopal bodies, the Bishop's attitude owards Presbyterians is still just as defined and as uncom-romising as is the attitude of the Vatican towards ourselves. eople who accept the Bishop's position at any rate know where ney are.

Now Lambeth has not said this. It might indeed as well ave deleted re-union from its programme. It has said neither Yea' or 'Nay' to the Bishop's principle. Leaving the whole uestion of the intrinsic character of episcopacy on one side, commends an episcopal ministry solely on the grounds of istory and of experience, as the one possible ministry for the hole united body of the Church. It proposes, in short, the cceptance not of a theory, but of a working actuality. If you ead Bishop Gore's book with assent, you will find much unsaid n the Lambeth Resolutions that you would be prepared to say. ou will probably dislike the phrase, 'Non-episcopal Churches.' ou may possibly find the suggestion as to the admission of on-episcopally ordained ministers to our pulpits, and as to the dmission of unconfirmed communicants of other bodies to our acrament, unwelcome, dangerous, or even worse; but, in the ain, if you can get over these details—though details may volve principles—then your position will be this: that though ne Lambeth Resolutions do not say all that Bishop Gore has aid in his book, still, with a certain amount of private inter-retation—and of that we are all guilty, and must be—you may

welcome the Resolutions without abandoning your conviction as to apostolic succession, as that doctrine stands expounded in the pages of *The Church and the Ministry*.

Professor Headlam's Bampton Lectures appeared in June, 1920, just before the Lambeth Conference. They were avowedly delivered and published with Lambeth in view, and probably exercised a good deal of influence. They attach more importance to the Church and less to the Ministry, and are generally in accord with the teaching of Hort's *Christian Ecclesia*. Their general position is that the evidence as to church order between the apostolic age and the date of Irenaeus is not sufficiently conclusive to form the basis of any rigid theory as to the nature of the ministry. The organisation of the Catholic Church was not based on specific apostolic rule. Historical continuity, not the transmission of gifts, is the true sense of apostolic succession, with which, I suppose, Professor Turner would agree. Following these lines to a practical conclusion, Dr. Headlam accepts non-episcopal orders as valid. He is in favour of the mutual recognition of orders, as they exist, with the general acceptance of episcopal orders for the future. Whatever commission we give to non-episcopally ordained ministers to officiate in our churches, should not, he thinks, be given with laying on of hands. Plainly we have here a very different attitude from that of Bishop Gore. How far was it accepted at Lambeth?

There is a good deal of difference. The Resolutions do not say, explicitly, that the non-episcopal bodies are Churches —unless the single phrase 'Non-episcopal Churches' be pressed to assert as much—nor do they recognize non-episcopal orders. Dr. Headlam's 'Yea' is unmistakable: Lambeth says neither 'Yea' nor 'Nay.'

The Resolutions, again differing, definitely suggest a commission by episcopal ordination. They would admit, on occasion, ministers, not episcopally as yet, to preach in our pulpits, but not to administer the Sacrament, which I suppose Headlam would, though his Lectures do not, I believe, say this quite definitely. These are notable points of difference. Where agreement is most marked is in regard to the grounds upon which episcopacy is recommended as the universally

esirable ministry for the future. It is in the interests of con-nuity and unity that it is commended both by the Resolutions nd the Bampton Lectures. Whether those who have read nese Lectures with assent, or those who give a similar adher-nce to Gore's *Church and the Ministry*, have the greater reason o welcome the Lambeth Resolutions, is a nice question. To lace the two books side by side with the Resolutions arouses nevitably the reflection that our fathers in God did not forget t Lambeth the characteristic Anglican principle of *ibis in nedio tutissimus*.

What of Mansfield? There is a curious difference of view s to the relation of the Mansfield and the Lambeth Resolu-ions. Bishop Welldon asks: What is the difference? Dr. Carnegie Simpson, one of the Mansfield Conference secre-aries, regards it as so great that the whole matter is almost rought for him to an *impasse*. The difference arises from the anguage of the Mansfield Resolutions. That Conference ecommended, along with interchange of pulpits and mutual dmission to the Holy Table, 'acceptance by ministers serving n any one denomination who may desire it, of such authori-ation as shall enable them to administer fully and freely in the hurches of other denominations,' this authorisation not being nderstood as in any sense re-ordination. 'Such authorisa-ion' is a phrase clearly capable of very different interpreta-ions. The *Guardian* described the Mansfield Conference as 'long step forward,' and I believe it was so. But it secured nanimity by leaving many points still open, and it called forth ery notable protests, some eminent persons even thinking its roposals would involve the English Church in disruption. Yet it does not seem that the divergence between Mansfield nd Lambeth is very wide, if each be interpreted somewhat in ne direction of the other.

Returning now from these comparisons to the Lambeth Resolutions themselves, one feature of them we may find to ave grown more clear. It is sufficiently evident that they epresent the maximum of unanimity attainable on the subject ithin the Anglican Communion. Quite deliberately, as it ppears, our fathers in God must have said, 'We will leave ndiscussed and unanswered important questions which lie at

the heart of the whole matter, and without altering our very diverse views on these, we will at any rate unite in practical suggestions for the future.' Given the conditions, it seems to me this was achieved with great success. The two obvious dangers of vague platitude and an internal split were at least avoided. The weakness of the proposals lies of course in what is not said, in what could not be said, in the questions which they were sure to call forth from the non-episcopal bodies. That is exactly what has happened.

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council have appointed a Committee to deal with the Lambeth Proposals, and that Committee has now reported, though the report is not strictly a reply. It is only advice to the various non-episcopal Churches as to what their reply to Lambeth should be. Practically, however, it is the immediate answer to the Lambeth appeal. The various non-episcopal bodies are not likely to diverge in any marked degree from the lines of response laid down after very full consideration by their own Committees. In any case, the report is deliberate, and important. What do you mean, the non-episcopal Churches say to us, by this commission through episcopal ordination? Do you mean that we are not true Churches and have no true ministry, and therefore must receive ordination? or, if you do not mean this, and we are a Church, and have a ministry, why can you not recognize us without ordination? They raise exactly the point with which Lambeth did not, and presumably, for internal reasons, could not deal.

Now it has been said, and said truly, that the Lambeth Proposals do ask a harder thing of the Nonconformists than we accept for ourselves. Our difficulty would of course arise if a miracle happened and re-union as between ourselves and Rome became a practical issue. But allowing all this, I am still inclined to think that the Nonconformists are not so appreciative as one might have wished of the genuine desire for re-union which is manifested in the Lambeth Report. They seem more anxious to assert the rightfulness of their own position than to realize the wider unity. Some of us have learned so much from the Public Orator in the University of Cam

bridge, that we can only regard with surprise and regret the ine followed in his short book, *The Free Churches and Re-union*, possibly consoling ourselves with the reflection that the book might not have been quite the same if it had not been originally written as articles for the *British Weekly*. However, here it is, and if Dr. Glover regards the proposed form of commission as a 'humiliation,' we must take it that this seriously is his view. The Report of the Free Church Committee does not definitely say as much, but there is clearly great difficulty among them as to the implications of the proposed episcopal ordination. They ask for more information. They raise just the questions upon which Lambeth was silent. Clearly they are keenly sensitive as to the interpretation which would, or might, be placed upon the acceptance on the part of Free Church ministers of the episcopal commission proposed by Lambeth. In effect, their reply is: 'Drop episcopacy as a condition, and we may see our way to respond to your appeal.'

This report, or rather the replies which will be based upon it, and will in all probability confirm it, will have to be dealt with in due course. That indeed will be the next official step. I believe something in the nature of a Standing Committee of the Lambeth Conference exists, and I suppose this body will deal with the replies when they come from the Free Churches. Upon what lines will the Anglican reply be framed? The Free Churches say: 'What we desire to know is this: Whether Anglicanism is prepared to recognize non-episcopal communions—or any of them—as corporate parts of the Church of Christ, and their ministries as ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments?' That is a plain question; a plain 'No' in answer will end the whole business, at any rate for our time: a plain 'Yes' will land us in internal divisions. Clearly a delicate situation. I have no great hopes that we shall be able to satisfy the Free Churches. But I will venture to suggest the lines upon which alone it seems to me an answer which might not prove disastrous could be given.

It should be frankly admitted to the Free Churches that a large section of our variegated communion neither regards the non-episcopal bodies as true Churches, nor accepts their ministries and Sacraments as valid. Anglo-Catholics would view

the Lambeth Appeal being such as to induce Nonconformity to accept. That at least is my diagnosis of the immediate situation, and personally I wish the prospects of re-union were brighter than they are.

Below this technical and doctrinal difficulty, however, lies a deeper cause. If the demand for re-union were stronger, if our sense of the spiritual as distinct from the denominational issues were keener, if we were less horribly contented with the *status quo*, the future would be guaranteed. Re-union would come in time. The will would provide the way. But I question the prevalence of the will. It was at work at Lambeth, and where you get men who have the mind of Christ, they can often, though not always, see the common ground beyond their diversities. But, for the most part, I think we rather enjoy our differences. We like contrasts and parties and divisions in our politics, and something of the same spirit comes into our religion. Coalitions are sometimes necessary, but they are rarely welcome, and negatives seem almost as inevitable in religion as they are in logic or electricity. Bishop Creighton, we remember, had a good word to say for our unhappy divisions. The average English Churchman may be glad to say he belongs to the Church, but he is certainly delighted to add that he is not a Nonconformist. If you could remove to-morrow the differences between ourselves and Nonconformity, I think you would almost deprive Dr. Clifford of his *raison d'être*. A great deal of the religious Press is partisan and unchristian in temper, and such are the papers that people will buy. Hear some vigorous curate asserting in his sermon that, if a Nonconformist entered that pulpit, he should feel it his duty to leave the Church. Hear a Baptist farmer on a Rural District Council discussing the Ecclesiastical Tithes (Rates) Act, 1920. Hear a rector of the old school express himself on the subject of the chapels in his parish. Watch how denominational distinctions re-appear in other domains, social, educational, political. Those are really the things that tell. Smith is the village carpenter and in the choir. He has a difference with the rectory over his quarterly account, so he sings next Sunday in the chapel choir instead. Mary is a little 'tweenie' from a Baptist home, and what a lot is said at home when they hear

Mary has been confirmed. The tragedy of the Christian religion is that in great things as well as in small we give nine-tenths of our attention to the points in which we differ, and let the great common heritage sink and dwindle into poor and unappropriated commonplace. No doubt it is all very human, and some of it is very petty and very trivial. But out of such sorry material we are hardly likely to weave the seamless robe of Christ. It took the Great War to make us co-operate for the good of the State, and even then the co-operation was very qualified. And I fear it will take more than the Lambeth Proposals to make us co-operate for the service of the Church of Christ in genuine whole-hearted fellowship. I recollect with what inward protest and impatience I heard the Archbishop, in his memorable sermon at the Southend Church Congress, express his conviction that in the matter of re-union movement must of necessity be slow. But he was right. He was wise there, as he has been in so much else. The old cleavages, the more modern variations, and above all, the fundamentally antagonistic temper of the natural man, are not matters to be dealt with lightly and off-hand. That is where the root of the difficulty lies. Till the general will for unity is stronger, the difficulties, and there are real difficulties, are hardly likely to be overcome.

Even if the Lambeth Proposals do not, as I anticipate, bring for the immediate present re-union, at least they mark a stage on the road. If they do not solve the problem, they show us the right spirit in which to approach it. Let me recur for one moment in conclusion to the vision and ideal with which we started, and remind you that the Holy City which John beheld not only lay four square, with a perfect symmetry of length and breadth and height, but that it also had twelve gates. I suppose that to the twelve gates there were twelve roads, and that all the twelve were intended for the use of travellers to the City. Was the old visionary giving us a hint, suggesting that in this divided and disappointing world we must each do our best and not expect too much? In the City of course it is different; the roads meet there. We shall arrive one day, but it is not yet.

BOOK NOTICES

THE FAITH OF A QUAKER.[1]

This volume, by Principal Graham, is divided into four books which deal respectively with the theological foundations of Quakerism, the work of representative Friends as pioneers of the movement, the superstructure which rises logically out of the few basic truths for the sake of which the Society exists, and finally the resulting outlook upon the world.

Theologically the Quaker belongs to the family of the world's mystics. Yet at the same time he is essentially the man of action, in whose eyes an effective organisation holds a real albeit a subordinate place in the success of a religious movement. Our author claims for Quakerism that 'it is the only considerable adventure in organised Mysticism which has made for itself a permanent place in Christian history during modern times.' Like all mystics the Quaker finds the focus of his faith in the doctrine of an immanent God. God dwells within the human heart; 'Heaven is not reached by way of the sky.' Early Friends were right in placing the authority of the Inner Light above that of the Bible, the authority of a God whose temple is the soul of man above the external pronouncements of a tradition or a book. 'There is that of God in every man' was an utterance true to the spirit of the Quaker Faith. Friends cut loose from the damnable doctrine of divine arbitrariness. They refused to follow Calvin, who 'for theological purposes reduced man to his lowest terms.'[2] Their mistake (one which could scarcely have been avoided in the seventeenth century) was the drawing of too sharp a distinction between human and divine, natural and supernatural, man and God.

To-day that mistake is no longer made. God must be thought of as 'an infinite Personality of which we are a part, as a leaf is of a tree.' The unity of God, Christ, Man is tight-linked. 'It leaves no room for the system-maker, who knows how to lay down the boundaries between God and Christ and the Holy Spirit and Humanity, and can arrange the edifice of an intellectual conception with its main lines and its partitions and its doorways from the divine to the human.' We can follow the writer in his belief that where Christ is concerned 'there needs to be no compound of human and divine, and there can be no antithesis.' 'To-day,' as he suggestively puts it, 'we may liken Christ's divinity to the scent given off by the flower of His humanity, and rejoice in the vigour of the flower.' We can follow him, too, in his desire to set aside 'the primitive notion of a physical divine paternity,' in his refusal to minimize the human grief, struggle and victory of the historical Jesus, in his conviction that the ideal and perfect man will be necessarily one with God, in the faith that 'freed from the physical body, Christ was able to communicate several times with His disciples,' in his identification of the Lord and the Spirit after the manner of Paul.

Principal Graham is an enthusiastic member of the Society for Psychical Research, and his own investigations into the nature of personality have led him to look with favour on the theories of the late Dr. Sanday

[1] *The Faith of a Quaker*, by John W. Graham. Cambridge University Press, 1920. Pp. 140. Price 21/- net.

[2] R. M. Jones, Introduction to W. C. Braithwaite's *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. xxxv.

with reference to our Lord's subliminal consciousness. He would find 'behind the human personality of Jesus a subliminal soul to whom the Spirit is given without measure.' We confess that here we find it hard to follow him. The uniqueness of Christ cannot be accounted for on the theory of a gift made to Him and deliberately withheld from other men.

The sketches of Quaker notables given in Book II are ably done, and have their place in illustrating for the reader unfamiliar with the early history of the movement the essential continuity of past and present, the right of Friends to-day to claim for themselves a place with Fox, Penington, Penn and Barclay in the apostolic succession of the Quaker Church. The purpose of these sketches, as their author reminds us, 'is to be fair historically to the founders, and to correlate the ancient position to the modern one here presented.' We are shown just enough of the vigour and versatility of Fox, the religious honesty of the gentle Penington, the breezy, democratic and somewhat ruthless temper of the youthful Penn, the splendid intellectual alertness of the mind of Barclay, to whet our appetite and make us ask for more. The reader who would make a closer acquaintance with these sturdy pioneers of the Quaker Faith can meet them in the stimulating pages of Mr. W. C. Braithwaite's books, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* and *The Second Period of Quakerism*. Interesting as are the present sketches, they perhaps lack something of that freshness of treatment, that sense of high-hearted adventure in the cause of truth by which Mr. Braithwaite's delightful volumes are so eminently characterised.

Book III deals with the Superstructure of Quakerism and contains much that is of value to the student of religious psychology. The causes of Quaker separation from the world are carefully analysed, and the survival value of early Quaker peculiarities temperately discussed. Art and Education were not among the prerogatives of early Friends. 'To most good men in the Restoration Period the theatre and the dance seemed the very gates to ruin, as indeed in that age they often were.' Education was long regarded as 'an Anglican preserve,' Friends' educational work was beset with difficulties of many kinds, religious tests were not abolished in the Universities till 1873, and for some years after that date Friends at Oxford and Cambridge were few and far between. Yet the policy of separation, though at times seemingly little short of imperative, is never really wise, for, as our author rightly remarks, 'men are saved by positive enthusiasms, and to establish regulation in matters not generally regulated is a lapse from the original liberty of the Spirit.'

Quaker asceticism in the matter of worship is, however, vigorously upheld. The value of 'the blissful or adoring instincts which are called into sensation by musical services' is discounted as on a lower plane than that of true devotion. In all stereotyped services, it is alleged, words become cheap and insincere, and a prodigality of emotion is demanded of the worshipper which it is not his to give. The requirements made from a Quaker congregation, while beyond doubt exacting, are defended as decisively worth while.

> 'Think what it means,' writes our author in a spirit almost of exultation, 'to have no one to be relied upon to preach to you, no one to sing to you, no music in your worship, no aesthetic help in carved column or stained glass, no one to tell you what to believe, no creed to cling to, no sacrament to solemnise you, no clergyman to look after you in pastoral fashion.'

What, then, it may be asked, has Quakerism to offer? The basis of its worship is silence, 'a silence filled with events,' a silence which makes

for fellowship and restores perspective, a silence in which the petty grudge, the mean hatred, the superficial estimate come up for judgement and are condemned, a silence in which God and man may find one another on the common meeting-ground of the human soul. When words come they 'do not break *into* the silence as an interruption, but rather break *out of* it as its natural and inevitable fruit.'[3]

With much of this many who are not Friends will be in very cordial agreement. A sense of reality is not the deepest impression made by attendance at Anglican services. No suggestion contained in the recent report on the Worship of the Church was more worth making than the proposal to try experiments in the suppression of choirs. There is the feeling of hurry and restlessness which does not make for inward harmony, and the verdict: 'Too much conventional patter,' though hardly polite, is one which we dare not pronounce untrue. The aim of every service should be to bring men and women into closer touch with the living God, and so into more vital fellowship with one another. Men must speak face to face with a real God, who makes real demands and offers real help. Psalms, hymns, prayers to be of use must give genuine expression to the needs and aspirations of ordinary people. So far as they fail in this they are an insult to God and so much waste of time for the congregation.

Principal Graham's strictures on Anglican services are wholesome reading, his apologia for Quaker simplicity has weight, and springs undoubtedly from the deep places of personal experience. Therefore it is the more to be wished that he had shown a truer comprehension of the infinite variety of human temperaments. Liturgical services are beset with dangers which should be neither ignored nor minimised, but the appeal to personal experience will prove that not alone in the Quaker Meeting House do men worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

Strong as is the condemnation of Anglican services, these receive gentler treatment at the hands of our author than that which he administers to the use of sacraments and the institution of a paid professional ministry, whether Anglican or Nonconformist.

The value of a lay ministry need not be questioned; the disadvantages of professionalism are patent and undeniable. Here, again, the Quaker case is a good one, though in this instance also it is somewhat spoiled by the author's over emphasis upon the acknowledged drawbacks of an ordained clergy in receipt of a salary.

In writing of the Sacraments, Principal Graham rightly refers to the remarkable courage of early Friends in setting aside Baptism and the Lord's Supper as tending to formalism and superstition in an age when their institution by the historical Jesus was unquestioned. He points out how, in this and other cases (*e.g.* episcopacy and the doctrine of the Trinity), modern criticism of the New Testament has given its support to Quaker rejections which were made originally in the teeth of the evidence and solely at the bidding of spiritual intuition. Our author seems to take almost a delight in building up his case for the conclusion that 'no sacrament was ever ordained by our Lord.' With that case as stated many Liberal Churchmen to-day would find themselves in agreement, nor would they question the claim that Quaker saints may live unbaptized and die unshriven. Experience proves that sanctity and sacraments are not inseparable. But experience proves not only that to

[3] See the pamphlet, *The Universal Light*, by A. B. Brown. R. Davis, 30 Leadhall Lane, Harrogate.

some sacraments are a hindrance; it proves that to others (and these not the weaker brethren alone) sacraments are indeed the means to new life and added power. To speak of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the great engine of the priesthood is not to tell the whole story; to assert that the Christian Eucharist 'has the same ancestor as the corn-baby at the old-fashioned harvest home' is legitimate provided that origin and validity are not confused in the inference drawn from the assertion; to define the Communion as 'a spiritual stimulant, the opium and the alcohol of the soul's desire,' and to compare its action upon the soul with the effect of a cup of coffee comes perilously near bad taste, and reveals a total failure to estimate at their true value the spiritual treasures of a brother man.

In Book IV the Quaker attitude towards Social Service, War, and a State Church are dealt with under the general title of the 'Outlook upon the World.' Quaker achievements in the field of Social Service are magnificent and unrivalled. The power behind the work comes from the conviction of Friends that 'because man is the home of God desecration of His temple is sacrilege.' The names of John Howard, John Woolman, John Bellers, Joseph Lancaster, Elizabeth Fry, Joseph Sturge, are names worthy to stand with those of the greatest benefactors of the human race. 'I believe,' writes Principal Graham, 'that our future depends upon our faithfulness to the service of society.' If he is right, the future of Quakerism is rich in promise. The statement of social duty issued to the Friends' Yearly Meeting in 1917 is an inspiration and a challenge to all Christians. In the work of Adult Schools we see a power for good whose influence it is scarcely possible to over-estimate; for the labours of Friends in the famine-stricken areas of Europe no praise can be too high.

Some will feel that Principal Graham's condemnation of a State Church, while it is not without value, is vitiated like so much else in his book by one-sidedness. With his assertion that 'the State has just as much to do with our religious life as it has with our married life, and that both are utterly out of its province' we can agree. From one point of view the words are no more than a truism. But to suppose that an official priesthood is merely the expression of a belief that human nature is weak and unreliable, and that to erect such a priesthood is to despair of the race is surely to talk nonsense. Many Anglicans hold no brief for Establishment, parsons in large quantities are sometimes unpleasant and frequently uninspiring, but for all that a man's motive in being ordained is something other than his despair of his fellow men.

The Quaker testimony against War is well known and receives able treatment from Principal Graham in what is by far the longest chapter of his book. The evils of War (evils which few if any would deny in the abstract) are convincingly enumerated; War's contradiction of all for what Christ stands is ruthlessly indicated; the testimony of a long line of Christian Fathers is quoted against it. In the present case moreover the force of the Quaker position is not weakened by the author's inability to see another side to the question. He recognises that the bitterest tragedies are those where good is pitted against good, he is ready to admit the distinction between wars of defence and of aggression, he pays generous tribute to the courage and honesty of the fighting soldier; and we on our part would be the last to question either the courage or honesty of the conscientious objector. With all that is said of the evil of War, of the need for constructive work in the cause of peace, of the sorry failure of the Churches to rise above national limita-

tions, Liberal Churchmen will be in enthusiastic agreement. But when War comes, when our efforts whether worthy or not have failed to prevent it, when, moreover, it is a war of defence and of defence only, as far as any war can be, surely right is on the side of him who fights. To live, as Fox put it, 'in the virtue of that life and power which takes away the occasion of all wars' is a noble ambition, yet admittedly Friends pay war taxes 'being compelled to receive the protection which the Army and Navy provide,' does it not therefore follow that so long as that protection is necessary the Army and Navy must not be classed as unchristian professions? So to class them is to acquiesce in the position that the spiritual superiority of Friends is only possible because others will do that work from which they shrink from fear of contamination. The testimony against War must not deteriorate into the willingness to be good at the expense of others.

Friends to-day stand avowedly with the Liberal Churchman rather than with the narrow Evangelicalism of a century ago. 'The first principle of Quakerism made Friends born critics when the time should be ripe, and in practice the Higher Criticism has found a readier home in the Society than in other orthodox Churches.' Yet as Liberals we are classed as 'too clerical.' Well, we can forgive the charge and be glad to claim kinship with the Quaker in the matter of intellectual honesty, religious freedom, and a faith based less on the statements of a formal creed than on the living witness of God's servants to the truth as it is in Jesus. 'If any man willeth to do His will he shall know of the teaching.'

W. M. Pryke.

CLERICAL VERACITY IN CHINA.*

*Letters to a Missionary,** by Mr. R. F. Johnston, is mainly devoted to drawing attention to the continued existence of a wide-spread belief, in the mission-field in China, in everlasting punishment. The writer urges that many Christians (Modernist and others) ignore the prevalence of this belief, and he hints at a certain amount of intellectual dishonesty in the matter. I had several talks with Mr. Johnston (who holds an important educational post in China) when he was preparing this book, in the course of which I urged that he was over emphasising the importance attached to the doctrine by the China Inland Mission and its general influence on their teaching. They do not really make this the centre of their gospel message, as Mr. Johnston seems to imply.

Nevertheless, Mr. Johnston puts before us in his *Letters* what deserves the consideration of all Modernists, for he has raised the whole question of clerical (and lay) veracity, and that not merely in regard to this particular belief in everlasting punishment.

Mr. C. H. S. Matthew, in Essay IV of *Faith and Freedom* says, in connection with the subject of the Virgin Birth, that he and his friends have no hesitation in repeating clauses in the Creed in which they do not believe, 'because we are honestly convinced that we have a firm hold on the truth which they were intended to guard.' It does not seem to me that this method will ever get us any further, except in a wrong direction —that of a chaos of misunderstanding. One is compelled to professions too obviously contradictory to the sanity of plain truthfulness to be for

* *Letters to a Missionary*, by R. F. Johnson. Watts & Co. (1920). 5s. net.

ever juggled with in this way. 'Restatement' and 'reinterpretation' cannot be made to cover a profession of belief in a direct opposite.

One may perhaps contend that the Thirty-nine Articles (for instance) were really intended to be interpreted on divergent lines, so as to retain within the National Church both Puritans and Romanists. Personally I claim as much right to interpret those which I can understand, for myself, as to ask Mr. Johnston to do it for me. But I would rather see them dropped.

Again, one may recognise that the Nicene Creed is the outcome of much ancient theological speculation, and that many modern Christians do not understand it, although they use it.

Mr. Johnston doubts if this sort of line is at all helpful to Christian belief. It does not certainly tell us what a modern Christian tries to believe. If our conviction is that character and conduct are more important than verbal expressions of belief, ought we not to aim at cutting out the latter, rather than continuing to say 'I believe' in the terms of formularies which are antiquated and convey to many a wrong impression of what our real beliefs are? Would it not be better for the Modernists—clergy and laity—to get together and challenge an issue? I do not necessarily say that it would. I am fully sensible of the value of patience in waiting for the current which is setting in our direction but may flow for years before there is any radical change. I know that ground may be lost by forcing issues. Sometimes I even fear men like Mr. Johnston may do disservice to the cause of many-sided truth by impetuous attacks on worn-out views which are gradually dying a natural death.

Yet there is a real problem, especially in reference to mission-work. At home, no doubt, the idea is becoming familiar that a man's views must be judged by his personal utterances and writings rather than by the formulas of the religious body to which he professes to belong. But non-Christians the world over may reasonably expect us to believe at least what we affirm our belief in at solemn services, and the more enlightened Christian adherents are, the more amazed they will be at our repudiating privately what we affirm publicly. These matters are of perhaps wider import than the one decaying doctrine of everlasting torment, which is not mentioned in the creeds most frequently used.[1]

This year a society of people was formed by some missionaries at a summer resort in China, calling itself the 'Bible Union.' They are pledged to propaganda to maintain belief in the literal verbal inspiration of the Bible and in the 'substitution' theory of the Atonement! Numerically those who hold these views are strong in China, including the widespread China Inland Mission and a section of American Presbyterians and others. They are by no means strong in missionary Councils, and their views are shared by hardly any of the (Protestant) denominational bodies, many of whom repudiate them strongly. If a Chinese, taught by the 'Bible Union,' should ask if we shared *these* views, we could show cause (when giving a negative answer) why it is not necessary that a man should retain these views who wishes to call himself a Christian. The argument would lie (apart from the question of Christian life) along lines already well known and illustrated by such men as Dr. Sanday in *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition,* a book read and quoted by Mr. Johnston.

[1] The Athanasian Creed has been, happily, omitted from the American Prayer Book and is therefore not found in the Chinese Version in use in the American Church Mission.

Modernists will feel this latter writer carries his admonitions to us (*e.g.* in Letter VI) to an extreme. We wonder he does not argue that a man who does not believe that the earth is flat must cease to call himself a Christian. For the Ascension is part of Christian teaching, and the doctrine as originally held (and held for hundreds of years) implied a belief that the earth is flat. This, of course, is puerile, yet some of the reasoning in the *Letters* is of a type we have learned to associate with Mr. Ronald Knox, whom Mr. Johnston admires for his candour.

F. E. A. SHEPHERD, M.A., Oxon.
(attached to the American Church Mission).
WU CHANG, CHINA.

THE RESURRECTION BODY.*

Speculative theology sustained no small loss through the early death of Mr. C. E. Rolt. His writings, few though they be, show abundantly that philosophic speculation was his strength. In this posthumous work he deals with the doctrine of the Resurrection Body in a manner that should commend itself to the modern mind.

As Dr. Sparrow-Simpson points out in his Introduction, two tendencies are noticeable in the author's treatment of his subject. At times he shows a marked tendency toward the orthodox conservative position: at others he takes a line which is conspicuously Modernist and Liberal. It is in the fifth chapter that this latter position is most apparent. Hitherto the author has followed a method which is more or less in line with the conservative teaching. He has begun his thesis with an analysis of St. Paul's doctrine of the Resurrection body, wherein it is maintained that the spiritual body is contained in essence within the natural body. ('Roughly speaking, here are three kinds of body—the Earthly, the Intermediate, and the Spiritual.') The second chapter applies this theory to the human body of Jesus, and the author sets out to show how the Resurrection appearances may be explained as materializations of the spiritual body. This idea is worked out in greater detail in the fourth chapter, where the interesting theory is advanced that the post-Resurrection appearances form a graduated series in which visibility and tangibility are increasingly eliminated in proportion to the individual recipient's spiritual penetration and faith.

In the fifth chapter the author treats of the problems connected with the raising of the dead. He adduces evidence from the New Testament stories in support of his contention 'that those who were thus brought back to life had never been really dead at all. They had been in a state of coma' . . . However one may regard these incidents in the New Testament, Mr. Rolt has presented a case in support of his view that demands a close and critical study. In the reviewer's mind this chapter is one of the most valuable in the book, contributing as it does to the solution of one of the greatest problems with which the critical student of theology has to do. The final chapter of the book deals with the relationship between the Mystical Body and the Eucharistic Body of Christ.

This essay deserves the close attention of those who believe that the Christian Church is called upon at all times to bring out of her treasures 'things new and old.'

H. L. HUBBARD.

* *The Spiritual Body*, by the late C. E. Rolt. Edited with an Introduction by W. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. Pp. ix + 145. S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EFFECT OF PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCILS.

To the Editor of the MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

The following answers sent in by the twelve parishes of my rural deanery to the question: What has been the effect of establishing a Parochial Church Council in your parish? should be of use. My own opinion is that where the incumbent is keen on working the new machinery, parish life has benefitted greatly.

1. Much greater interest.
2. There was far too much of the churchwardens and a few individuals running the church. Now more people are interested and there is a broader spirit in evidence.
3. No effect owing to peculiar conditions of parish.
4. Much more interest in Church life.
5. People on P.C.C. very interested and doing more for the Church.
6. Very little if any. People reported too dull to take interest. Only eighteen came to Parochial Church Meeting.
7. None; because (1) P.C. Councillors are never all there and (2) have as yet no powers.
8. P.C.C. meetings well attended. The 'powers' must be known before the effects can be realized.
9. P.C.C. brings people more together and they have a chance of making suggestions and so take more interest in the working of their church.
10. Nil.
11. Created considerably more interest and roped in many nominal Church people.
12. By every criterion, material and spiritual, it has done immense good.

R.D.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION STUDY CIRCLES.

SIR,

At a meeting of London members who were present at the Conference last August at Somerville College, it was decided that in view of the very wide area covered by the London Branch, and consequent difficulty of bringing members together and arranging meetings, an attempt should be made to form small groups in each district where possible, as study circles. A small beginning was made in the autumn in the N.W. district at 40 Hamilton Terrace.

Owing to the present high price of books, and the fact that most people are very fully occupied, it was thought better not to follow the lines of the regulation Study Circle, which necessitates every member buying the book and writing paper, &c., but that a book should be read aloud and afterwards discussed quite informally.

This Circle has only women members, numbering fourteen. The average attendance has been from eight to ten, as some cannot come regularly. They meet at 4.30, the reading beginning at 5.15 and ending about 6.15. The book chosen was Dr. T. R. Glover's *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*. It has proved very interesting and very suitable for the purpose of discussion.

It is much hoped that now one Circle has been started others will be formed in different London districts. Circumstances in each case would determine whether they should be held in the afternoon or evening, include both men and women, and whether the members should be both lay and clerical, or only lay. The value of such a gathering is its informality, the social intercourse being as much a means of mutual help as the study of the chosen subject.

If several Circles are eventually formed, it would then be possible to arrange for occasional larger gatherings to include members of two or three Circles in neighbouring districts.

K.M.H.

PRAYER-BOOK REVISION.

SIR,

Mr. J. Hector de Courcelles (*Modern Churchman,* April, p. 45) suggests that the words 'Do this,' &c., in the Prayer of Consecration are unwarranted. Though not in the text of the Gospels, we must not forget that we owe them to St. Paul, whose account of the Institution of the Eucharist is of the very highest importance; for he tells us he received it, as he did *his*—or as he emphasizes it—*my* Gospel by Revelation; not in a 'vision' but 'clairaudiently,' *i.e.* by hearing Christ's voice, as he did at his conversion. Consequently the probability of his being the author of the sentence is enhanced.

St. Paul, moreover, is the only one who explains the additional words —τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν—which puzzled the copyists, who added 'broken' in St. Paul's account (I. Cor. ii, 24), now erased from the R.V.; and 'given' in St. Luke's account (xxii, 19, *cf.* I. Cor. x, 17; Eph. v, 29 ff.).

I would suggest the necessity of two other changes of much greater importance; the removal, or alteration, of the Introduction of about ten lines; for, although the word 'Atonement' is not mentioned, the three words—'Sacrifice,' 'Oblation' and 'Satisfaction' are all expositions of the meaning of Atonement, now cancelled from the New Testament (Rom. v, 11, *R.V.*).

Several learned theologians from Jowett (1859) to Dean Rashdall (1919) have shown the untenability of the doctrine of expiation. The latter writer observes:—'Forgiveness is dependent upon no condition whatever, but repentance and the amendment, which is the necessary consequence of sincere repentance' (*Idea of Atonement,* p. 25). He adds:—'There is not the slightest suggestion of belief in the atoning efficacy of Christ's death.'

St. Paul's account of the Institution should be inserted in place of St. Matthew's; for the latter has erroneously written: 'This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.'

Dr. Rashdall observes that the latter clause should be cancelled.

St. Paul's words are: 'This cup is the New Covenant (*R.V.*) in my blood.' 'Testament' means a 'Will' (Heb. ix, 16 f.) which makes all Christians to be, as it were, legatees, who are thought to receive 'Gifts of Grace,' such as the preservation of the body and soul unto eternal life; whereas a covenant demands *works* to be done by the covenanter.

Comparing the Old Covenant with the New, Moses sacrificed and sprinkled the blood upon the people, and thereby *sealed* the covenant; whereon all the people said: 'All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do' (Ex. xxiv, 7).

Similarly, on drinking the wine, which represents Christ's blood, the communicant should say: 'All the "words" of the Lord Jesus Christ will I keep.'

For Christ had said: 'My words are spirit and are life' (John vi, 63).

JOHN HENSLOW.

THE MODERNISM OF GEORGE TYRRELL AS THE BASIS OF A NEW CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

SIR,

In view of the constant demand for a new Christian philosophy, a study of the writings of the late Father Tyrrell seems to me desirable. Though excommunicated, he remained always loyal to his Church: and he grasped firmly the great principle, that though the theology of a church, being human, must be liable to error, underneath the theology is the infallible inspired revelation, which it has been 'the desire of all nations' to apprehend; *e.g.*, he says in his book on mediævalism: 'Catholic truth is elaborated by the collective religious experience and reflection of the whole Church. Revelation is the supernaturally imparted experience of realities. The Church's divine commission is to teach and propagate a new life, a new hope, a new spirit, and not the analysis of these experiences' (*viz.* theology). Here we can quote the Founder of the Jesuits, Ignatius Loyola, as on his side, when he teaches that the way to find out the will of God is to observe whether a given resolution is accompanied by spiritual peace or spiritual restlessness: and when he tells us that it is God's prerogative to cause these effective States of the Soul as a means of guidance, as feelers whereby we can grope our way from point to point, and when he adds that these states give rise to inspired thoughts and furnish a criterion of our own uninspired guesses at divine truth.

It seems to me that this thought ought to be the basis of a 20th century Christian philosophy.

Christ certainly meant something when he promised that the Holy Spirit would lead the disciple unto all truth.

We cannot admit that that promise was fulfilled in the theology of the Creeds: but we may admit that, underneath that human theology, there lies a partial fulfilment of it. The same thing applies to the Bible, and to tradition. The business of a true Christian philosophy is to gather together the 'inspired thoughts' arising from spiritual peace-given States of the Human Soul: and harmonizing them with God's teaching through science, gradually progress towards the discovery of fresh realms of Truth.

Such a philosophy will aid us in solving what the Abbé Loisy calls 'the question lying at the bottom of the religious problem of to-day,' *viz.*, 'whether man's conscience finds in it no echo truer, or more real than itself.'

A Christian philosophy may therefore draw its materials, not only from the Catholic, Eastern, or Protestant sources, but from the religions antecedent to, and outside Christianity, and its precursor, Judaism. It can take as its motto, '*semper, ubique, ab omnibus,*' and find inspired States of the Soul among the Sumerian-derived early Egyptians with their resurrection teachings, as well as the Semitic-Babylonian pre-Jewish thinkers. It can look to the morals of Confucius, the altruism of Buddha, the belief in the spirit world of the ancestor worshippers, and draw from them all some inner spiritual conceptions which should guide men's souls.

RAKE MANOR, MILFORD, SURREY. BERESFORD POTTER.

[The Editor regrets that he is unable to find space for a number of letters.]